



Memorandum

Date: DECEMBER 12, 2006

To: PLANNING COMMISSION

From: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Subject: URBAN SERVICE AREA APPLICATION USA 05-02, ZONING AMENDMENT APPLICATION ZA 06-01 and ANNEXATION APPLICATION ANX-03-01: EDMUNDSON – OAK MEADOW PLAZA LLC (APN's 767-19-020, 024 & 028 and 767-15-026)

REQUEST

Consider adoption of a Pre-zoning resolution for the subject property to establish R-1 12,000 Residential Planned Development (RPD) and Open Space zoning classifications for the site. This resolution would supersede the prior resolution which had recommended R-1 12,000 and Open Space zoning of the site.

RECOMMENDATION

Applications USA 05-02, ZA 06-01 and ANX 03-01: Open the public hearing and table the applications.

SITE DESCRIPTION

Location: The project site is located on the west side of Sunset Road and approximately 200 feet north of West Edmundson Ave.

Site Area: 34 acres

Zoning / General Plan / Land Uses:

Project Area: County Hillside / Single Family Low and Open Space / vacant

North: County Hillside / County Rural / vacant

South: County Hillside / County Rural / vacant

East: R-1 7,000 RPD / Single Family Medium / Parkside and Kendall Hill residential subdivisions

West: County Hillside / County Rural / vacant

The 20 acres proposed for addition to the USA is gently sloping, with maximum slopes of 12.5 percent. Adjacent areas to the north, south and west (including the 14 acres proposed for open space) are generally more steeply sloping. The area is adjacent to the city limits and the Parkside and Kendall Hill subdivisions on the east. Approximately 60 percent of that property boundary is adjacent to Sunset Rd.

BACKGROUND

These items were heard by the Planning Commission on March 14th, March 28th, and October 24th of this year. At the October 24th meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed two conceptual land use plans for the 19-acre area proposed for development. One of the alternative plans had been reviewed by a number of the residents of the neighboring subdivisions and it was reported that the residents were “largely, though not entirely supportive” of the plan. The other conceptual plan was developed by the applicant in response to concerns expressed by the City’s Development Review Committee regarding access to the proposed development. The second alternative plan has not been reviewed by residents of the neighboring subdivisions.

The Planning Commission took no action at the meeting over concern that nearby residents may not be fully aware of the alternative plans under consideration. The Commission continued the items to this meeting and directed staff to inform all property owners in the adjacent subdivisions of the alternative conceptual plans that are being considered.

ADDITIONAL APPLICATION

Earlier memos regarding these applications referenced an approved non-binding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the applicant and City. That MOU identifies the expectations of the applicant should the City approve the requested actions. As the City considers approval of the applicant’s requested actions, it is appropriate that the City and applicant enter into a binding Development Agreement that secures the applicant’s commitments. That document, which requires review and approval by the Commission and Council, is currently being drafted. However, it will not be completed in time for review by the Commission at its December 12th meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes there is benefit in hearing the Development Agreement at the same time as the other applications under consideration. It is anticipated the Development Agreement will be ready for Commission consideration in late January or early February. As a result, Staff recommends the Commission table the current applications. When the Development Agreement is ready for review, all of the applications will be re-noticed. That notice will include the Commission’s request that property owners in the adjacent subdivisions be provided copies of the alternative plans and a description of those alternatives.